

Serial Number: 09/738,208

Docket Number: 10005368-1

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this Response, claims 2-11 and 13-20 remain pending in the present patent application. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 4, 9, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Appropriate amendments to claims 4, 9, and 15 have been made that render this rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 4, 9, and 15 under §112 be withdrawn.

In item 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,953,733 issued to Langford-Wilson (hereafter "Langford") and US Patent 6,223,191 issued to Truelson (hereafter "Truelson"). A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP §2143.03, In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant notes that claims 1 and 12 have been previously canceled, thereby rendering this grounds of rejection moot with respect to such claims. For the reasons that follow, Applicant asserts that the cited combination of references fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claims 2-11 and 13-17. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2-11 and 13-17 be withdrawn.

To begin, claim 13 states as follows:

13. A method for pruning an article comprising the steps of:  
storing the original article in a memory of the computer system;  
creating a pruning copy of the original article to be reduced;  
storing the pruning copy in the memory;  
removing an amount of text from the pruning copy, thereby  
creating a reduced pruning copy having an amount of text that is less than the  
amount of text of the original article; and  
determining an information adequacy of the text of the reduced  
pruning copy relative to the text of the original article.

The Office Action states that claim 13 is a dependent claim on page 3 of the Office Action. However, it is noted that claim 13 is an independent claim as per previous amendments.

In addition, with respect to claim 13, the Office Action states:

Serial Number:09/738,208

Docket Number: 10005368-1

"733 does not explicitly teach, "removing an amount of text from the pruning copy, thereby creating a reduced pruning copy having an amount of text that is less than the amount of text of the original article", however as taught by '191 at col. 8, lines 5-40 (i.e. ... calculates the weighted score for the current line, it examines BestLines list 240 to determine whether any permutation of line N has been stored which ends in the same word segment as the current permutation of line N (step 406)...by removing the last word segment from the current permutation, and repeating the previously described steps from step 403. If the threshold is exceeded, it is considered extremely unlikely that acceptable permutations will be generated by further removal of word segments... ....)" (Office Action, page 4).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Specifically, at column 8, lines 5-40, Truelson states:

"After the formatter calculates the weighted score for the current line, it examines BestLine list 240 to determine whether any permutation of Line N has been stored which ends in the same word segment as the current permutation of Line N (step 406). Specifically, it refers to BestLine field 205 of array 201 to obtain the head of the list 240 corresponding to Line N, and scans the list for a list entry 241 having a last segment field 245 equal to the last segment of the current permutation. If such an entry exists, the score of the entry in the list (stored in weighted score field 242) is compared with the score of the current permutation (step 407). If either there is no previously stored permutation, or if the current permutation has a better (lower) score than the previously stored permutation, then the current permutation is stored in BestLine list 240 as a saved permutation, replacing the previously stored permutation if necessary (step 408).

The formatter then determines whether a letterspacing threshold has been exceeded for the current permutation (step 409). I.e., does the current permutation use letterspacing, and are individual letterspaces in excess of a predetermined threshold. If not, another permutation is generated (step 410) by removing the last word segment from the current permutation, and repeating the previously described steps from step 403. If the threshold is exceeded, it is considered extremely unlikely that acceptable permutations will be generated by further removal of word segments (i.e., further increasing the amount of letterspacing required. In that event, the formatter examines best line list 240 for the next saved permutation of previous line (N-1) (step 412), and repeats starting with step 401 if additional permutations of Line N-1 have not been considered. After all permutations of Line N-1 that were saved in BestLine list all permutations of Line N-1 that were saved in BestLine list 240 have been considered, the formatter returns (step 413), having completed its analysis of Line N.

The formatter then determines whether N has reached the limit of MacLines, indicating that all lines have been permuted (step 305). If not, it repeats steps 303-305. If all lines have been permuted, the

Serial Number:09/738,208Docket Number: 10005368-1

formatter then compares the weighted scores of all saved permutations of Line N in BestLine list 240 (step 306). The lowest weighted score represents the best formatting of the paragraph. The formatter then constructs the formatted paragraph in final form by beginning with lowest scoring permutation of Line N, and following links in source permutation field 243 to each successive previous line permutation which resulted in the final lowest score (step 307)."

As set forth above, Truelson does not discuss the concept of removing an amount of text from a pruning copy so that the pruning copy has an amount of text that is less than the amount of text of the original article. Rather, Truelson discusses moving segments of words around in a single paragraph so as to reduce the amount of hyphenation and other problems that are inherent in the presentation of text using a "maximum fit" algorithm as described in column 1, lines 55-67 of Truelson. In fact, in the end, the paragraph for which the segments are shifted from line to line is not reduced in length at all. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Truelson fails to show or suggest the element of removing an amount of text from the pruning copy thereby creating a reduced pruning copy having an amount of text that is less than the amount of text in the original article. Rather, Truelson teaches away from this concept in that Truelson operates to preserve the full text of a paragraph.

In addition, the Office Action further states:

"In determining an informational adequacy of the text of the reduced pruning copy relative to the text of the original article", however as taught by '191 at col. 12, lines 20-30 (i.e. ... formula is used for providing a weighted score to permutations of text lines for purposes of judging which is best. It would be possible to employ any number of variations on this formula to take into account other factors, or to ignore factors taken into account by the formula described herein, or to change the relative weightings of the factors. It would further be possible to allow the user to customize the weighting factors ...)." (Office Action, page 4).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, at column 12, lines 19-37, Truelson states:

"In the preferred embodiment described above, a particular formula is used for providing a weighted score to permutations of text lines for purposes of judging which is best. It would be possible to employ any number of variations on this formula to take into account other factors, or to ignore factors taken into account by the formula described herein, or to change the relative weightings of the factors. It would further be

Serial Number:09/738,208Docket Number: 10005368-1

possible to allow the user to customize the weighting factors. It is believed that the algorithm described above will generally yield the best possible formatting within the given constraints. However, it would alternatively be possible to employ simpler algorithms which would improve upon the conventional maximum fit formatting. Although such simpler algorithms would not necessarily provide results as good as those provided by the algorithm of the preferred embodiment, they would generally be implemented more easily and would generally execute faster. An example of such an alternative is described below."

As stated above, Truelson discusses weighting the various permutations of text lines to determine which one is best formatted. However, no informational adequacy of the text of a reduced pruning copy is determined relative to the text of the original article as set forth in claim 13. Specifically, the ultimate text of the original article is not changed by Truelson. Rather, Truelson is merely examining formatting within given lines of text for purposes of eliminating unnecessary hyphenation for better readability. No text is ultimately removed. Also, no information adequacy of the actual articles expressed in the text is measured.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejection of claim 13 is improper. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2 and 7 be withdrawn to the extent that they include the elements of removing an amount of text from the pruning copy, thereby creating a reduced pruning copy having an amount of text that is less than the amount of text of the original article, and determining an information adequacy of the text of the reduced pruning copy relative to the text of the original article as set forth in claim 13. Also, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3-6, 8-11, and 14-20 be withdrawn as depending from claims 2, 7, or 13, respectively.


Serial Number: 09/738,208

Docket Number: 10005368-1

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael J. D'Aurelio  
Reg. No. 40,977

D'Aurelio & Mathews, LLC  
5755 Granger Road, Suite 365  
Cleveland, OH 44131  
Phone: (216) 459-8302  
Fax: (216) 459-8301